

am



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,989	01/23/2001	Evan Jaqua	TAL/3983.003	4200

7590 03/30/2005
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

EXAMINER

WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/768,989

Applicant(s)

JAQUA, EVAN

Examiner

James S. Wozniak

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 7/1/2004, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 11/1/2004, amending Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 18, 22-24, 27, and 44, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding the amended limitations of Claims 1 and 23 and the limitations of Claims 24, 29-30, and 41 (*Amendment, Pages 12-21*). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments. Also, the applicant's arguments with respect to **Claim 23** have been considered, but are moot with regards to the new grounds of rejection, necessitated by amendment, in view of Goldberg et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,161,082*).

2. Due to the amended Claim 1, the examiner has withdrawn the previous 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection directed towards a lack of antecedent basis.

3. Due to the amended Claim 24, the examiner has withdrawn the previous claim objections directed towards minor informalities.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to **Claim 1**, the applicant argues that Nosohara fails to teach identifying an entity on the basis of associated characteristics (*Amendment, Page 13*), however the examiner notes that Nosohara (*U.S. Patent: 5,956,740*) teaches a means for searching for and locating a document based upon a document characteristic such as a title or bibliographic data (*prior office action, Pages 4-5*). Each document (entity) stored within the system taught by Nosohara has associated characteristics (title, bibliographic data, etc., Col. 6, Lines 6-60). Nosohara further teaches the ability of a user to search for a particular document based upon the associated characteristics (characteristics for searching, Col. 6, Lines 6-60, and performing a document search, Col. 4, Lines 52-67). Further, Nosohara, in Col. 5, Lines 44-50, evidences this search according to associated characteristics including a document title. Thus, Nosohara teaches locating an entity on the basis of associated characteristics.

Further in regards to Claim 1, the applicant argues that neither Hamann nor Nosohara teaches a text translation table to translate keywords for keyword document searching (*Amendment, Page 14*), however the examiner notes that it is the *combination* of Nosohara in view of Hamann (*U.S. Patent: 6,092,036*) that discloses such a limitation. Nosohara teaches the ability to perform a translation of a search term (*Col. 4, Lines 21-31*). The only limitation of Claim 1 Nosohara does not specifically teach is performing a translation using a translation table. As noted in the previous office action (*Pages 4-5*), Hamann cures this deficiency of Nosohara. Hamann teaches the use of a translation table for performing text translation (Col. 3, Line 35-Col. 4, Line 44, and Fig. 2, Element 18). Combining the teachings of Hamann with the teachings of Nosohara provides the benefit of more efficient text translation, since Hamann relies on a previously existing translation stored in a translation table to prevent redundant translation (Col.

2, Lines 7-12). Nosohara and Hamann are also analogous art since they are from a similar field of endeavor in text translation. Therefore, since it is the *combination* of Nosohara and Hamann that teaches a text translation table to translate keywords for keyword document searching, Claim 1 remains rejected.

Also, in regards to the applicant's argument that Hamann teaches away from Nosohara (*Amendment, Page 14*), there is no mention in Nosohara that a translation table cannot be used to perform the translation. Freely entered keywords not stored in a table (since they would not pertain to any of the searchable documents) would merely result in a search result of zero within the scope of Nosohara in view of Hamann. Thus, Nosohara does not teach away from Hamann.

With respect to **Claims 2 and 16**, the applicant argues that Nosohara fails to teach that a search characteristic is one of a product and a service, however the examiner notes that such a characteristic is within the scope of the teachings of Nosohara and also points out that Nosohara suggests the ability to search for a document based on a product type (automobile, vehicle, Col. 5, Lines 44-50). Thus, Claims 2 and 16 remain rejected.

Claims 3-4, 12-15, and 17-22 are argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 14*). Thus, since the rejection of independent claim 1 is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to **Claim 5**, the applicant argues that Beurket et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,122,666*) fails to teach a registration form, reading data identifying an entity and an entity characteristic, and storing that information (*Amendment, Page 15*), however it is the *combination* of Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket that teaches the aforementioned limitations. Beurket is relied upon for the teaching of a product order registration form (*Col. 7, Line 62- Col. 8, Line 7*). As noted above,

Nosohara discloses the teachings regarding the entity data, while Beurket further suggests the obvious step of temporarily storing recently accessed data objects (*Col. 3, Lines 66- Col. 4, Line 1*). Thus, since all of the limitations of Claim 5 are taught by the *combination* of Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket, Claim 5 remains rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 6**, see the response regarding Claims 2 and 16.

Claim 7 is argued as further limiting its parent claim (*Amendment, Page 15*). Thus, since the rejection of claim 5 is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to **Claim 8**, the applicant argues that Nosohara fails to teach that a search characteristic is an entity activity however the examiner notes that such a characteristic is within the scope of the teachings of Nosohara and also points out that Nosohara suggests the ability to search for a document based on a document activity type (automotive field of technology, Col. 5, Lines 44-50). Thus, Claim 8 remains rejected.

With respect to **Claim 9**, the applicant argues that Beurket fails to teach a method of displaying a registration form (*Amendment, Page 16*), however it is the *combination* of Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket that teaches the aforementioned limitations. As noted in the prior office action (Pages 9-10), Beurket teaches the display of an order registration form, and as noted above, Nosohara teaches the search for an entity characteristic and Hamann teaches the use of a translation table. Thus, since all of the limitations of Claim 9 are taught by the *combination* of Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket, Claim 9 remains rejected.

Claim 10 is argued as further limiting its parent claim (*Amendment, Page 16*). Thus, since the rejection of claim 9 is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 11**, see the response regarding Claim 8.

The applicant's arguments with respect to **Claim 23** have been considered, but are moot with regards to the new grounds of rejection, necessitated by amendment, in view of Goldberg et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,161,082*).

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claims 24 and 30** (*Amendment, Pages 17-18*), see the response regarding Claims 1 and 5.

Further, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (*i.e., locating individuals, businesses, or organizations as an entity [Amendment, Page 17]- the "entity" within the claim limitations has not been clearly defined and can be thought of as any discrete unit or, in the case of the prior art, a document*) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 25**, see the response regarding Claims 2 and 16.

Claims 26 and 30-32 are argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 18*). Thus, since the rejection of the parent claims is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claims 27 and 32**, see the response regarding Claim 8.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 28**, see the response regarding Claim 1.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 29**, see the response regarding Claims 1 and 5.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 33**, see the response regarding Claims 1 and 5.

Claim 34 is argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 20*). Thus, since the rejection of the parent claims is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 35**, see the response regarding Claims 1 and 5.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 36**, see the response regarding Claims 1 and 5.

Claims 37-40 are argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 20*). Thus, since the rejection of the parent claims is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 41**, see the response regarding Claims 1, 5, and 9.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 42**, see the response regarding Claims 2 and 16.

Claims 43 and 45 are argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 21*). Thus, since the rejection of the parent claims is maintained, the dependent claims also remain rejected.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding **Claim 44**, see the response regarding Claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claim 23** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,161,082*).

With respect to **Claim 23**, Goldberg recites:

Selecting a message text, including a plurality of words from a plurality of message texts in a native language of a communicant (*selecting an email, comprising sentences, for communication with another user, Col. 3, Lines 21-48*);

Selecting a language of a recipient (*language format, Col. 5, Lines 26-34*);

Searching a database comprising at least one translation of at least one of message text for a translation of said selected message text in said language of said recipient, said translation comprising a plurality of words (*database of previously translated message sentences, Col. 4, Lines 9-22*); and

Transmitting a message to said recipient, said message including said translation of said message text in said language of said recipient (*Col. 3, Lines 49-56*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-4 and 12-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nosohara (*U.S. Patent: 5,956,740*) in view of Hamann (*U.S. Patent: 6,092,036*).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Nosohara discloses:

Method of locating an entity in a multilingual environment comprising the steps of:

Storing an entity identification and at least one entity characteristic in an entity record; said entity characteristic being a term in a first language (*document title, Col. 6, Lines 26-60, bibliographic data, Col. 6, Lines 6-60, and document storage means, Fig. 1*);

Specifying said second language term for said descriptor as a search parameter (*Col. 4, Lines 21-31*); and

Searching said entity record for an entity characteristic corresponding to said search term (*Col. 4, Lines 52-67*).

Nosohara does not specifically suggest utilizing a translation table to translate search terms, however, the use of a translation table in performing text translation is well known in the art, as is evidenced by Hamann:

Constructing a translation table including at least a first language term and a second language term for a descriptor (*translation table builder relating source and target languages, Col. 3, Line- Col. 4, Line 44, and Fig. 2, Element 18*).

Nosohara and Hamann are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the use of a translation table in text translation as taught by Hamann with the keyword translation method for multilingual document searching as taught by Nosohara to provide a well known means of organizing and clearly relating search terms of different languages for the implementation of a more efficient text translation process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hamann with Nosohara for the benefit of implementing a more organized and efficient translation of keywords in a multilingual document search engine, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

With respect to **Claim 2**, Nosohara in view of Hamann teaches the multilingual document search engine as applied to Claim 1. Nosohara in view of Hamann does not specifically suggest that a search term or keyword is a product or service; however, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art that a term utilized by a search engine could be any variety of terms in a number of different topic areas, the scope of which would include product or service related terms. Therefore, based on user interest, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2655

skill in the art, at the time of invention, that a search term would be related to that of a product or service so that a user could obtain pertinent documents as a search result.

With respect to **Claim 3**, Nosohara further discloses:

At least one of said first language and said second language comprises a natural language (*multiple natural languages, Col. 2, Lines 7-15*).

Claim 4 contains subject matter similar to Claims 2 and 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons, wherein the recited activity would be related to a product or service as a search term based upon user interest.

With respect to **Claim 12**, Nosohara discloses:

Selecting said second language as a language of a search (*Col. 4, Lines 21-31*);

Displaying a search form in said second language (*search engine application, Col. 4, Lines 18-51, and display input means, Fig. 1*);

Displaying a second language term from said translation table (taught by Hamann, as applied to Claim 1) for at least one descriptor (*confirming search terms, Col. 5, Lines 12-25*);
and

Selecting at least one said displayed descriptor as said search parameter (*confirming search terms, Col. 5, Lines 12-25*).

Nosohara in view of Hamann does not specifically teach that the displayed search form is presented in a user selected language, however, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to display a text document in a user selected language to ensure user comprehension. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the

time of invention, that the search engine application would be presented in a user-selected language to ensure user comprehension.

Claim 13 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 14 contains subject matter similar to Claims 2 and 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons, wherein the specialized terminology would be related to a product or service as a search term based upon user interest.

With respect to **Claim 15**, Nosohara further recites:

Comparing said search parameter to said entity characteristic included in said entity record (*Col. 5, Lines 26-60*);

Designating as said search parameter another term for said descriptor from said translation table (*taught by Hamann, as applied to Claim 1*); said another term for said descriptor being in another language (*Japanese search term translated to an English search term for a database search, Col. 5, Lines 26-60*); and

Repeating steps (a) and (b) for at least said another term for said descriptor in said first language (*synonym search, Col. 5, Lines 26-60*).

Claim 16 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 17 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 18 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 19**, Nosohara additionally recites:

The step of reporting a result of said searching in said second language (*search results, Col. 6, Lines 6-22*).

With respect to **Claim 20**, Nosohara discloses:

Reading a first content of a search result report in said second language from a resource file (*displaying translated bibliographic data for search results, Col. 6, Lines 6-49*);

Reading said second language term for said descriptor from said translation table (translation table, taught by Hamann and as applied to Claim 1, used to translate bibliographic data); and

Displaying said search result form comprising said first content and said second language term for said descriptor (*displaying translated search results, wherein the sentences containing the search terms are provided to the user, Col. 6, Lines 6-49*).

Claim 21 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 22 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

9. **Claims 5-11 and 24-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nosohara in view of Hamann, and further in view of Beurket et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,122,666*).

With respect to **Claim 5**, Nosohara in view of Hamann teaches the method of language selection, keyword identification, and associated storage means for use with a multilingual search engine, as applied to Claim 1. Although Nosohara does teach a search engine application

for data entry (Col. 4, Lines 21-31), Nosohara in view of Hamann does not specifically teach displaying a registration form, which is utilized by a search engine, in a selected language, however, Beurket discloses:

Displaying a registration form in said first language (*Col. 7, Line 62- Col. 8, Line 7*).

Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of displaying a registration form to a user in a selected language as taught by Beurket with the method of language selection, keyword identification, and associated storage means for use with a multilingual search engine as taught by Nosohara in view of Hamann to allow a user to search, access, and order consumer goods exclusive to a web page in a foreign language. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to store the order registration form results in a storage means such as that disclosed by Nosohara so that a business employee would be able to access and process a registration form in order to complete an order and retain customer information for future transactions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Beurket with Nosohara in view of Hamann for the benefit of obtaining a method and system that allows a user to search, access, and order products from a foreign language web page, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 5.

Claim 6 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 7 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 8 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 9**, Nosohara in view of Hamann teaches the use of a translation table and search term descriptor with a multilingual document search engine. Nosohara in view of Hamann does not specifically suggest the display of a registration form that incorporates a search engine for products, however, Beurket recites:

Reading a first content of said registration form in said first language from a resource file (*accessing order registration form data in a foreign language, Col. 7, Line 62- Col. 8, Line 7*).

Displaying a registration form comprising said first content and first language term for said descriptor (displaying order registration form content in a selected language from a translated foreign web page, *Col. 7, Line 62- Col. 8, Line 7*).

Nosohara, Hamann, and Beurket are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of translating an order registration form with respect to a selected language as taught by Beurket with the translation table and multilingual document search engine as taught by Nosohara in view of Hamann in order to provide a comprehensible version of an order form in a foreign language featuring a product search method, so that a user can easily access product information while completing an order form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Beurket with Nosohara in view of Hamann for the benefit of obtaining a comprehensible version of an order form in a foreign language featuring a product search method, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 9.

Claim 10 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 11 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 24 and 30 contain subject matter similar to Claims 1 and 5, and thus, are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 25 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 26 and 31 contain subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, are rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 27 and 32 contain subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, are rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 28**, Nosohara further discloses:

Entity characteristic is said registration language term for said descriptor (*document title, before translation, as a search result, Col. 6, Lines 6-49*).

Claim 29 contains subject matter similar to Claims 1, 5, and 15, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 33 contains subject matter similar to Claims 5 and 9, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Furthermore, Nosohara teaches a data input means (Fig. 1), which the examiner takes official notice it would be obvious to use for input of the registration data, taught by Beurket and applied to Claim 5, in order to allow a user to enter pertinent information for a registration form.

Claim 34 contains subject matter similar to Claim 12, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 35 contains subject matter similar to Claim 35, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Additionally, Nosohara shows the communication control means of Fig. 1.

Claim 36 contains subject matter similar to Claims 1, 12, 15, and 33, and thus is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 37**, Nosohara additionally discloses:

A first language message file comprising a first language translation of a message (*documents and related bibliographic information messages in a plurality of languages, Col. 6, Lines 6-49*);

A second language message file comprising a second language translation of said message (*translating bibliographic information, Col. 6, Lines 6-49*); and

A communication module to transmit said first language translation from said first language message file in response to a user selection of said second language translation of said message (*transmission of bibliographic information to a translation function to produce a bibliographic information result in a second language, Col. 6, Lines 6-49 and Fig. 1*).

With respect to **Claim 38**, Nosohara further shows:

A communication interface to a data processing network enabling communication between said system and a remote data processing device (*Fig. 1*).

With respect to **Claim 39**, Nosohara shows:

At least one of said registration module, said translation table, and said search engine is installed on said remote data processing device (*search engine interface at a local device, Col. 4, Lines 21-45*).

With respect to **Claim 40**, Nosohara shows:

At least one of said registration module and said search engine comprises a document displayable on said remote data processing device (*Figs. 9A-C*).

Claim 41 contains subject matter similar to Claims 1, 5, 9, and 15, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Additionally, Nosohara shows:

A communication interface enabling a remote data processing device to communicate with said system (*Fig. 1*).

Claim 42 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 43 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 44 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 45**, Nosohara further discloses:

An integration engine requesting at least one translation of a descriptor term in response to an input of an entity characteristic not matching a descriptor term in said translation table (*translation of a search term if its related conditions do not coincide with a document database, Col. 4, Lines 31-45*).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action (Claim 23). Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Flannagan et al (U.S. Patent: 5,966,685)- teaches the translation of Internet message board texts.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (703) 305-8669

Application/Control Number: 09/768,989
Art Unit: 2655


Page 20

and email is James.Wozniak@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays, 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached at (703) 305-4827. The fax/phone number for the Technology Center 2600 where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

James S. Wozniak
3/4/2005



DAVID L. OMETZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER